

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

Dale K. Galipo, Esq. (Bar No. 144074)
dalekgalipo@yahoo.com
21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310
Woodland Hills, California, 91367
Telephone: (818) 347-3333
Facsimile: (818) 347-4118

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

JEFFREY AMADOR, VERONICA
BENNETT, individually and as
successors-in-interest to Connor
Amador, deceased;

Plaintiff,

vs.

CITY OF LOMPOC; ALEXANDER
JUSTICE; DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:25-cv-167

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1. Fourth Amendment—Detention and Arrest (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
2. Fourth Amendment—Excessive Force (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
3. Fourth Amendment—Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
4. Substantive Due Process (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
5. Battery (Survival and Wrongful Death)
6. Negligence (Survival and Wrongful Death)
7. Violation of Cal. Civil Code § 52.1

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

2 Plaintiffs, JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT individually
3 and as successors-in-interest to Connor Amador, Deceased; for their Complaint
4 against Defendants CITY OF LOMPOC; ALEXANDER JUSTICE; and DOES 1-
5 10, inclusive, allege as follows:

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 1. This Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331
8 and 1343(a)(3)-(4) because Plaintiffs assert claims arising under the laws of the
9 United States including 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Fourth and Fourteenth
10 Amendments of the United States Constitution. This Court has supplemental
11 jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' claims arising under state law pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
12 1367(a), because those claims are so related to the federal claims that they form part
13 of the same case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

14 2. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because
15 Defendants reside in this district and all incidents, events, and occurrences giving
16 rise to this action occurred in this district.

17 **INTRODUCTION**

18 3. This civil rights and state tort action seeks compensatory and punitive
19 damages from Defendants for violating various rights under the United States
20 Constitution and state law in connection with the fatal officer-involved shooting of
21 Connor Amador on December 29, 2023.

22 **PARTIES**

23 4. At all relevant times, Decedent CONNOR AMADOR
24 ("DECEDENT") was an individual residing in the City of Lompoc, County of Santa
25 Barbara, California.

26 5. Plaintiff JEFFREY AMADOR is an individual residing in the City
27 of Santa Maria, County of Santa Barbara, California. JEFFREY AMADOR is the
28

1 natural mother of DECEDENT and sues in his individual capacity and as successor-
2 in-interest to DECEDENT. JEFFREY AMADOR seeks survival damages, wrongful
3 death damages, compensatory damages and punitive damages under federal and
4 state law.

5 6. Plaintiff VERONICA BENNETT is an individual residing in the
6 City of Arroyo Grande, County of San Luis Obispo, California. VERONICA
7 BENNETT is the natural mother of DECEDENT and sues in his individual capacity
8 and as successor-in-interest to DECEDENT. VERONICA BENNETT seeks survival
9 damages, wrongful death damages, compensatory damages and punitive damages
10 under federal and state law.

11 7. At all relevant times, Defendant CITY OF LOMPOC (“CITY”) is
12 and was a duly organized public entity existing under the laws of the State of
13 California. CITY is responsible for the actions, omissions, policies, procedures,
14 practices and customs of its various agents and agencies, including the Lompoc
15 Police Department (“LPD”) and its agents and employees. At all relevant times,
16 Defendant CITY is and was responsible for assuring that the actions, omissions,
17 policies, procedures, practices, and customs of the and its employees and agents
18 complied with the laws of the United States and of the State of California.

19 8. At all relevant times, Defendant ALEXANDER JUSTICE
20 (“JUSTICE”) and DOES 1-7, inclusive (collectively “OFFICER DEFENDANTS”)
21 were duly appointed by CITY as LPD Officers and employees or agents of CITY,
22 subject to oversight and supervision by CITY’s elected and non-elected officials.
23 JUSTICE and DOES 1-7 acted under color of law, to wit, under the color of the
24 statutes, ordinances, regulations, policies, customs, and usages of defendant CITY
25 and the LPD, and under the color of the statutes and regulations of the State of
26 California.

1 9. At all relevant times, Defendants DOES 8-10 are managerial,
2 supervisory, and policymaking employees of the LPD, who were acting under
3 color of law within the course and scope of their duties as managerial, supervisory,
4 and policymaking employees for the LPD. DOES 8-10 were acting with the
5 complete authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant CITY.

6 10. In doing the acts and failing and omitting to act as hereinafter
7 described, JUSTICE and DOES 1-7 were acting on the implied and actual
8 permission and consent of Defendant CITY.

9 11. JUSTICE and DOES 1-10 are sued in their individual capacities.

10 12. The true names and capacities of DOES 1-10 are unknown to
11 Plaintiffs, who otherwise sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs
12 will seek leave to amend this Complaint to show the true names and capacities of
13 the Defendants when they have been ascertained. Each of the fictitiously named
14 Defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct or liabilities alleged
15 herein.

16 13. At all times mentioned herein, each and every defendant was the
17 agent of each and every other defendant and had the legal duty to oversee and
18 supervise the hiring, conduct, and employment of each and every defendant.

19 14. All of the acts complained of herein by Plaintiff against Defendants
20 were done and performed by said Defendants by and through their authorized
21 agents, servants, and/or employees, all of whom at all relevant times herein were
22 acting within the course, purpose, and scope of said agency, service, and/or
23 employment capacity. Moreover, Defendants and their agents ratified all of the acts
24 complained of herein.

25 15. On or around June 24, 2024, Plaintiffs filed comprehensive and
26 timely claims for damages with the City of Lompoc, State of California pursuant to
27
28

1 the applicable sections of the California Government Code. Said claims were
2 rejected on July 17, 2024.

3 **FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

4 16. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the
5 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set
6 forth herein.

7 17. This incident occurred on or about December 29, 2023 at
8 approximately 1:00 a.m. DEFENDANT JUSTICE and DOES 1-7 encountered
9 DECEDENT in a parking lot outside of a small "Circle K" convenience store at a
10 gas station at or around the area of 1421 E. Ocean Ave. Lompoc, California 93436.

11 18. DECEDENT stood outside of the entrance of the convenience store.

12 19. Without warning or justification, OFFICER DEFENDANTS shot at
13 DECEDENT without justification, thereby using excessive force against him.

14 20. On information and belief, OFFICER DEFENDANTS failed to give
15 a warning that deadly force was going to be used before shooting at DECEDENT,
16 despite it being feasible to do so.

17 21. On information and belief, DECEDENT did not pose an immediate
18 threat of serious bodily injury or death to anyone at the time of the shooting.
19 OFFICER DEFENDANTS were not faced with an immediate or imminent defense
20 of life situation and had less than lethal alternatives available to subdue
21 DECEDENT and to take DECEDENT into custody.

22 22. On information and belief, despite having knowledge that
23 DECEDENT was seriously injured by OFFICER DEFENDANTS' use of deadly
24 force, OFFICER DEFENDANTS failed to timely summon medical care or permit
25 medical personnel to treat DECEDENT. The delay of medical care to DECEDENT
26 was a contributing cause of DECEDENT's harm, injury, pain and suffering, and
27 ultimate death.
28

1 and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to
2 OFFICER DEFENDANTS.

3 29. As a result of their misconduct, OFFICER DEFENDANTS are liable
4 for DECEDENT's injuries, because they were integral participants in the wrongful
5 detention and arrest.

6 30. Plaintiffs bring this claim as successors-in-interest to the DECEDENT,
7 and seek survival damages, including physical and mental pre-death pain and
8 suffering, loss of life, and loss of enjoyment of life for the violation of
9 DECEDENT's rights. Plaintiffs also seek attorney's fees under this claim.

10
11 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **Fourth Amendment —Excessive Force (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

13 (By Plaintiff against OFFICER DEFENDANTS)

14 31. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the foregoing
15 paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
16 herein.

17 32. OFFICER DEFENDANTS used excessive force against DECEDENT
18 when he they shot him several times. OFFICER DEFENDANTS' unjustified use of
19 force deprived DECEDENT of his right to be secure in his person against
20 unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to DECEDENT under the Fourth
21 Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the
22 Fourteenth Amendment.

23 33. As a result of the foregoing, DECEDENT suffered great physical pain
24 and emotional distress up to the time of his death, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of
25 life, and loss of earning capacity.

26 34. The conduct of OFFICER DEFENDANTS was willful, wanton,
27 malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of
28

1 DECEDENT, and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive
2 damages.

3 35. The shooting was excessive and unreasonable, and DECEDENT posed
4 no immediate threat of death or serious bodily injury at the time of the shooting.
5 Further, OFFICER DEFENDANTS' shooting and use of force violated their
6 training and standard police officer training.

7 36. As a result of their misconduct, OFFICER DEFENDANTS are liable for
8 DECEDENT'S injuries, either because they were integral participants in the use of
9 excessive force, and/or because they failed to intervene to prevent these violations.

10 37. Plaintiffs bring this claim as a successors-in-interest to the DECEDENT,
11 and seeks survival damages, including pre-death pain and suffering, emotional
12 distress, loss of life, and loss of enjoyment of life, for the violation of
13 DECEDENT's rights. Plaintiffs also seek attorney's fees under this claim.

14
15 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

16 **Fourth Amendment —Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

17 (By Plaintiffs against OFFICER DEFENDANTS)

18 38. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the
19 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set
20 forth herein.

21 39. The denial of medical care by OFFICER DEFENDANTS deprived
22 DECEDENT of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches
23 and seizures as guaranteed to DECEDENT under the Fourth Amendment to the
24 United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.

25 40. OFFICER DEFENDANTS failed to provide needed medical care to
26 DECEDENT, failed to timely summon needed medical care for DECEDENT,
27 prevented medical care personnel from timely treating DECEDENT, and refused to
28

1 permit medical care personnel to access and care for DECEDENT at the scene for
2 an appreciable time after the incident.

3 41. As a result of the foregoing, DECEDENT suffered great physical pain
4 and suffering up to the time of his death, loss of enjoyment of life, loss of life, and
5 loss of earning capacity.

6 42. OFFICER DEFENDANTS knew that failure to provide timely medical
7 treatment to DECEDENT could result in further significant injury, the unnecessary
8 and wanton infliction of pain, or death, but disregarded that serious medical need,
9 causing DECEDENT great bodily harm and death.

10 43. The conduct of OFFICER DEFENDANTS was willful, wanton,
11 malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of DECEDENT
12 and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to
13 OFFICER DEFENDANTS.

14 44. As a result of their misconduct, OFFICER DEFENDANTS are liable
15 for DECEDENT'S injuries, either because they were integral participants in the
16 denial of medical care, and/or because they failed to intervene to prevent these
17 violations.

18 45. Plaintiff brings this claim as a successor-in-interest to the DECEDENT,
19 and seeks survival damages, including pre-death pain and suffering, loss of life, and
20 loss of enjoyment of life for the violation of DECEDENT'S rights. Plaintiff also
21 seeks attorney's fees and costs under this claim.

22 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

23 **Substantive Due Process (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

24 (By Plaintiffs against OFFICER DEFENDANTS)

25 46. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the foregoing
26 paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
27 herein.

1 47. Plaintiff JEFFREY AMADOR had a cognizable interest under the Due
2 Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be
3 free from state actions that deprive him of life, liberty, or property in such a manner
4 as to shock the conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state
5 interference in her familial relationship with his son, DECEDENT.

6 48. Plaintiff VERONICA BENNETT had a cognizable interest under the
7 Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution
8 to be free from state actions that deprive her of life, liberty, or property in such a
9 manner as to shock the conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state
10 interference in her familial relationship with her son, DECEDENT.

11 49. The aforementioned actions of OFFICER DEFENDANTS, along with
12 other undiscovered conduct, shock the conscience, in that they acted with deliberate
13 indifference to the constitutional rights of Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and
14 VERONICA BENNETT, and with purpose to harm unrelated to any legitimate law
15 enforcement objective.

16 50. As a direct and proximate result of these actions, DECEDENT
17 experienced pain and suffering and eventually died. OFFICER DEFENDANTS
18 thus violated the substantive due process rights of Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR
19 and VERONICA BENNETT to be free from unwarranted interference with her
20 familial relationship with DECEDENT.

21 51. As a direct and proximate cause of the acts of OFFICER
22 DEFENDANTS, Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT
23 suffered emotional distress, mental anguish, and pain. Plaintiffs JEFFREY
24 AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT have also been deprived of the life-long
25 love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and sustenance of
26 DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of their natural
27 lives.

1 52. The conduct of OFFICER DEFENDANTS was willful, wanton,
2 malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of DECEDENT
3 and Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT and therefore
4 warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to OFFICER
5 DEFENDANTS.

6 53. Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT bring this
7 claim as individuals for the interference with their relationship with her son,
8 DECEDENT and seek wrongful death damages for the violation of Plaintiffs
9 JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT's rights. Plaintiffs also seek
10 attorney's fees under this claim.

11 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

12 **Battery**

13 (BY Plaintiffs against All Defendants)

14 54. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the
15 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set
16 forth herein.

17 55. OFFICER DEFENDANTS, while working as sheriff's Officers for
18 LPD, and acting within the course and scope of their duties, intentionally shot
19 DECEDENT multiple times and used unreasonable and excessive force against him.
20 As a result of the actions of OFFICER DEFENDANTS, DECEDENT ultimately
21 died from his injuries. OFFICER DEFENDANTS had no legal justification for
22 using force against DECEDENT, and their use of force while carrying out their
23 duties as police officers was an unreasonable and non-privileged use of force.

24 56. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of OFFICER
25 DEFENDANTS as alleged above, DECEDENT sustained injuries, experienced pain
26 and suffering, died from his injuries and also lost his earning capacity. Also as a
27 direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct as alleged above, Plaintiffs
28

1 JEFFERY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT suffered emotional distress and
2 mental anguish. Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT also
3 have been deprived of the life-long love, companionship, comfort, support, society,
4 care and sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the
5 remainder of their natural lives.

6 57. CITY is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of OFFICER
7 DEFENDANTS pursuant to section 815.2(a) of the California Government Code,
8 which provides that a public entity is liable for the injuries caused by its employees
9 within the scope of the employment if the employee's act would subject him or her
10 to liability.

11 58. The conduct of OFFICER DEFENDANTS was malicious, wanton,
12 oppressive, and accomplished with a conscious disregard for the rights of
13 DECEDENT, entitling Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA
14 BENNETT, as successors-in-interest to DECEDENT, to an award of exemplary and
15 punitive damages as to OFFICER DEFENDANTS.

16 59. Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT bring this
17 claim as individuals and as successors-in-interest to DECEDENT. Plaintiffs seek
18 survival damages, including pain and suffering, and wrongful death damages under
19 this claim.

20 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

21 **Negligence**

22 (By Plaintiffs against all Defendants)

23 60. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the
24 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set
25 forth herein.

26 61. Law enforcement officers, including Defendants, have a duty to use
27 reasonable care to prevent harm or injury to others. This duty includes using
28

1 appropriate tactics, giving appropriate commands, giving warnings, and not using
2 any force unless necessary, using less than lethal options, and only using deadly
3 force as a last resort.

4 62. OFFICER DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 8-10 breached this
5 duty of care. Upon information and belief, the actions and inactions of OFFICER
6 DEFENDANTS, and Defendants DOES 8-10 were negligent and reckless, including
7 but not limited to:

- 8 (a) the failure to properly and adequately assess the need to use
9 force or deadly force against DECEDENT;
- 10 (b) the negligent tactics and handling of the situation with
11 DECEDENT, including pre-shooting negligence;
- 12 (c) the negligent use of force, including deadly force, against
13 DECEDENT;
- 14 (d) the failure to provide prompt medical care to DECEDENT;
- 15 (e) the failure to properly train and supervise employees, both
16 professional and non-professional, including OFFICER
17 DEFENDANTS and OFFICER DEFENDANTS;
- 18 (f) the failure to ensure that adequate numbers of employees with
19 appropriate education and training were available to meet the
20 needs of and protect the rights of DECEDENT;
- 21 (g) the negligent handling of evidence and witnesses;
- 22 (h) the negligent communication of information during the incident.

23 63. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct as alleged
24 above, and other undiscovered negligent conduct, DECEDENT experienced pain
25 and suffering ultimately died. Also as a direct and proximate result of Defendants'
26 conduct as alleged above, Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA
27 BENNETT suffered emotional distress and mental anguish. Plaintiffs JEFFREY
28

1 AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT also have been deprived of the life-long
2 love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care and sustenance of
3 DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of their natural
4 lives.

5 64. CITY is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of OFFICER
6 DEFENDANTS and Defendants DOES 8-10 pursuant to section 815.2(a) of the
7 California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is liable for the
8 injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if the
9 employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

10 65. Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT bring this
11 claim as individuals and as successors-in-interest to DECEDENT. Plaintiffs seek
12 survival damages, including pain and suffering, and wrongful death damages under
13 this claim.

14 **NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Violation of Cal. Civil Code § 52.1**

16 (By Plaintiffs against all Defendants)

17 66. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in the
18 foregoing paragraphs of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set
19 forth herein.

20 67. California Civil Code, Section 52.1 (the Bane Act), prohibits any
21 person from using violent acts or threatening to commit violent acts against another
22 person for exercising that person's constitutional rights, which can be shown by a
23 reckless disregard for that person's civil rights.

24 68. On information and belief, OFFICER DEFENDANTS, while working
25 for the CITY and acting within the course and scope of their duties, intentionally
26 committed and attempted to commit acts of violence against DECEDENT or acted
27
28

1 in reckless disregard of DECEDENT's civil rights, including by shooting him
2 without justification or excuse, and by denying him necessary medical care.

3 69. When OFFICER DEFENDANTS shot DECEDENT numerous times,
4 either by integrally participating in the shooting or by failing to intervene, they
5 deliberately subjected DECEDENT to excessive force that was beyond what was
6 necessary and coercively interfered with his civil rights to be free from unreasonable
7 searches and seizures, to due process, to equal protection of the laws, to medical
8 care, to be free from state actions that shock the conscience, and to life, liberty, and
9 property.

10 70. On information and belief, Defendants specifically intended to violate
11 DECEDENT's constitutional rights as stated above, as demonstrated by OFFICER
12 DEFENDANT's reckless disregard for DECEDENT's constitutional rights, which
13 he was fully entitled to enjoy. Thus, Plaintiffs can recover for violation of the Bane
14 Act as successor-in-interest to DECEDENT. *See Reese v. County of Sacramento*,
15 888 F.3d 1030, 1040-45 (2018).

16 71. On information and belief, DECEDENT reasonably believed and
17 understood that the violent acts committed by OFFICER DEFENDANTS, inclusive
18 were intended to coercively interfere with DECEDENT's civil rights, to discourage
19 him from exercising the above civil rights or to prevent him from exercising such
20 rights.

21 72. Defendants successfully interfered with the above civil rights of
22 DECEDENT.

23 73. The conduct of Defendants was a substantial factor in causing
24 DECEDENT's harms, losses, injuries, and damages.

25 74. Defendants DOES 8-10 are vicariously liable under California law and
26 the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.

1 75. CITY is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of OFFICER
2 DEFENDANTS and Defendants DOES 8-10, inclusive pursuant to section 815.2(a)
3 of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is liable for
4 the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if the
5 employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

6 76. The conduct of Defendants was malicious, wanton, oppressive, and
7 accomplished with a conscious disregard for DECEDENT's rights, justifying an
8 award of exemplary and punitive damages as to OFFICER DEFENDANTS.

9 77. Plaintiffs bring this claim as successors-in-interest to DECEDENT
10 and seek survival damages, including emotional distress, loss of life, and loss of
11 enjoyment of life under this claim. Plaintiffs also seek treble damages, attorney's
12 fees, and costs under this claim.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs JEFFREY AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT, individually and as successors-in-interest to Connor Amador, requests entry of judgment in their favor and against Defendants CITY OF LOMPOC, ALEXANDER JUSTICE; DOES 1-10, inclusive, as follows:

- A. For compensatory damages in whatever other amount may be proven at trial, including both survival damages and wrongful death damages under federal and state law;
- B. For funeral and burial expenses, and loss of financial support;
- C. For punitive damages against the individual defendants in an amount to be proven at trial;
- D. For statutory damages;
- E. For treble damages pursuant to California Civil Code Sections 52, 52.1;
- F. For interest;
- G. For reasonable attorneys' fees, including litigation expenses;
- H. For costs of suit; and
- I. For such further other relief as the Court may deem just, proper, and appropriate.

DATED: January 7, 2025

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

By /s/ Dale K. Galipo

Dale K. Galipo
Attorneys for Plaintiff JEFFREY
AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT

Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

Dale K. Galipo
Attorneys for Plaintiffs JEFFREY
AMADOR and VERONICA BENNETT